

During the hearing, I was struck by the testimony of Ms. Audrey Haynes, Executive Director of the Business and Professional Women/USA, an organization that represents some 70,000 working women with more than 2,000 local groups, one-third of whom are small business owners, at least one in every congressional district.

Ms. Haynes pointed out that at \$8,500 a year, the "minimum wage worker" is more appropriately referred to as the "miracle worker".

The typical "miracle worker" is a single parent, with Children.

At the "miracle wage" of \$4.25 per hour, each week, she brings home \$182 after taxes.

She uses her "miracle wage" for child care at \$50 a week; for minimal food at \$65 a week; for essentials such as clothing, personal and health care products and doctor bills at \$50 a week; for rent in basic housing at \$85 a week; and for public transportation at \$20 a week. She spends nothing on recreation or personal pleasure. And, at the end of the week, she still has a growing deficit of \$88 each week.

With a modest increase in the minimum wage of ninety cents, and with the earned income tax credit, which is in some doubt because it too is under attack, the "miracle worker" can cut her deficit in half.

Mr. Speaker, I am at a loss as to how some of my colleagues can push for deficit reduction and a balanced budget, while refusing to pass a minimum wage increase that would be used by twelve million working Americans for that very same purpose.

The Small Business Administration's Office of Advocacy has assured us that the impact of a minimum wage increase would not be dramatic.

Fewer than ten percent of the Nation's small businesses would be affected.

That is because, contrary to popular belief, most minimum wage workers are employed by big business, not small business. Only 2.5 million minimum wage workers are employed by businesses with fewer than ten employees.

In addition, most small business owners already pay above the minimum wage. That is the only way to attract and keep good workers.

Moreover, businesses with receipts of less than \$500,000 are exempt from minimum wage laws, unless involved in interstate commerce.

Mr. Speaker, a miracle is a mystery, a wonder, an enigma, a conundrum, a puzzle. How do these miracle workers survive at the wages they are paid? Perhaps the answer is that many do not.

Perhaps that is why drug-driven violence, teen pregnancy, homelessness and hopelessness so permeate our communities.

Ms. Haynes shared with us that twenty years ago her mother was a minimum wage worker, and today, in Columbia, KY, she still earns just above the minimum wage.

The minimum wage for many is not a training wage. It is not a temporary wage. It is not a teenage wage; it is a miracle wage.

I ask my colleagues to imagine feeding yourself and two children on \$65 a week. Imagine clothing yourself, paying for personal and health care products and doctor bills on \$50 a week.

You do not go to the dentist on that budget.

Perhaps if you can for one moment imagine the life of a miracle wage worker, the mystery may clear up and reality may set in.

Pass the minimum wage increase.
It does not take a miracle.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. RIGGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. RIGGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

COULD PRESIDENT CLINTON HAVE WON IN 1992 IF HE RAN ON WHAT HE DELIVERED?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LINDER] is recognized for 25 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, on the Sunday after BOB DOLE's famous "enough is enough" speech on the floor of the Senate in December, a commentator said, "At least there is one adult among them."

The media enjoyed portraying the conflict on the budget as adolescent behavior when even they must know that we are engaged in the most profound political debate since 1932. It can be defined in a few words: "Who decides—Washington or you?"

Do we continue 64 years of increasing the role of the Federal Government in making decisions on your behalf, or do we return to freedom and opportunity which made this the wealthiest, most generous nation in the history of the planet? Do we trust the bureaucrats and politicians, or do we trust you?

The Clinton victory in 1992 was the culmination of the liberal dream. It is true that he ran as a "New Democrat". It is also true that he moved sharply to the left even before he was sworn in. A promise of a middle-class tax cut became the largest tax increase in history. Ending welfare as we know it turned out to be a Government job if no other job could be found. And health care reform ended up being the largest attempted takeover of the private economy in the history of the nation. And, of course, he led off with gays in the military. It is easy to see why that was not mentioned in the campaign. Does anyone believe that Clinton would have won in 1992 if he had campaigned on what he delivered?

The Clinton philosophy was outlined best in a 1958 book entitled, "The Af-

fluent Society," by John Kenneth Galbraith. It essentially said that Americans do not make too little money, they make too much, but they make bad choices with their dollars. It is the obligation of an educated government to tax those dollars from them and make better choices on their behalf.

If you look at the five major initiatives of the first two Clinton years—the budget, crime, welfare, education, and health care—all called for increasing taxes and increasing the numbers of decisions that would be made in Washington.

It is important to point out here that the Clintons are sincere. They truly do want to shape a future for our children and grandchildren that is warm and safe and secure and fair. If you're curious about what that future would look like, read anything that has come out of the Children's Defense Fund over the last 20 years.

Conservatives do not seek to shape the future because we do not know how. I could not satisfy 20 percent of the people in any given crowd. Each American looks to the future with different hopes and dreams and talents. I do know this, I could build a future that my daughter would love and my son would hate. So we want to leave your dollars in your pockets and you and 260 million other Americans, deciding on your own behalf hundreds of times a week, will shape the future. You will decide, not Washington. I do not have any idea what that future will look like but I will be right in there with you making my personal choices.

Now you see how deep and fundamental are the differences. Who decides?

This difference became crystal clear in the negotiations with the President over the budget. Frankly, we were not that far apart on the numbers. We want to increase spending 3 percent; the President wants to increase spending 4 percent. We want to assume a revenue increase of 5 percent; the President wants to assume a revenue increase of 5½ percent. We want to increase Medicare 62 percent over 7 years. The President wants to increase it 64 percent. Those are the differences on which the President has built his case that Republicans are proposing "extreme" cuts.

That is not where the discussions broke down. They broke down because Senator DOLE and Speaker GINGRICH were not willing to compromise on our values. We believe that giving seniors more choices in Medicare will cause them to shop their health care for the best deal and that competition will bring down costs.

Let me give you one example. One of the many meetings on transforming Medicare included Healthcare benefits managers. The John Deere Co. has formed its own health care company to control its costs. I asked the president of John Deere health care what it would cost the Federal Government if John Deere kept its retirees in their own health care system. He said \$4,000

per year and he would make a profit off them. We are paying \$5,200 this year per person. His offer amounted to a 25 percent savings.

Why can we not get President Clinton to agree? because the liberals will not let him loosen the Federal grip on your choices. They feel that you make selfish decisions and that bureaucrats make fair decisions. Again, who decides?

We also insisted that after spending \$5.5 trillion in the war on poverty over the last 30 years, we lost the war. We want to return those Medicaid and welfare dollars to the State and local communities to aid the less fortunate.

Again, the liberals cannot let loose of the Federal grip on those decisions. If they return decisions to individuals and communities the glue that holds the coalitions that comprise the Democrat Party dissolves. That glue is the power to decide for you.

The level of invective aimed at efforts to reform the welfare state is nothing short of astonishing. Governor Engler was accused in the press of causing people to commit suicide. We have been accused of starving children. And you will hear much more.

In Thomas Sowell's new book "The vision of the Anointed," You know who the anointed are, the sensitive, the caring, the compassionate, the thoughtful, Sowell notes how the critics of the "anointed", from Malthus to Burke to Hayek, always spoke generously of the motives of the left even while questioning their policies.

Milton Friedman criticized the Great Society, but he always says it was born of noble intentions.

However, the responses from the "Anointed" to their critics were always personal. The critics's motives were questioned. They were called mean-spirited, hard-hearted, and cruel.

When Thomas Malthus criticized the vision of Godwin and Condorcet he said, "I do not question their candor or their integrity. I question their politics."

Godwin's response? A personal attack on Malthus, whom he called "the malignant man".

John Lewis has equated GINGRICH to Hitler and the Republicans in the House to Nazis. That was a new low for those who substitute name-calling for debate.

Noting has changed in over 200 years. While attacking us on personal grounds it is increasingly clear that liberals have less interest in program beneficiaries than in the power to decide. That is what the anger is about: losing power. And they will stop at nothing to regain that power, including lying.

G.K. Chesterton said, "I believe in Liberalism today as much as I ever did. But, oh, there was a happy time when I believed in liberals."

Oh, there was a happy time. It was the time between 1948 and 1968 when poverty dropped from 32 percent to 13 percent and black poverty from 90 percent to 32 percent. We witnessed the

largest migration of blacks into management in the history of the country. In 1960 black illiteracy was 16 percent, and the black family was the most conservative, spiritual and family oriented segment of our society.

Then the poverty programs kicked in. \$5.5 trillion later the poverty rate is 14 percent in general, and among blacks 33 percent. Illiteracy among blacks is rising rapidly. Nearly 70 percent of black babies are born out of wedlock, and the black family is under serious assault.

This is not to say that blacks are the problem. They are not. But in 1965, for the reasons we all know, a larger percentage of them were poor, and the Government helped them the most.

I grew up in a small town in northern Minnesota near two Chippewa Indian reservations. The Indian children went to school with us. Every fifth-grade class had an Indian child at the top of the class. They did not graduate: teen age pregnancies, crime, alcohol, violence, no father, in the homes.

For over a hundred years America rounded the Indians up onto reservations and bureaucrats told them where to go to school, which dentist and doctor to see, where to buy school clothes, and we paid the bill. The influence of the breadwinner was replaced by a bureaucrat with a Government check, and the breadwinner left.

I am the only white man that ever played baseball with the Inger Indians. I was the catcher, and we had a pitcher on the team who had a curve ball that looked like it was coming at you from third base. He was offered a minor league contract that summer, but he didn't know if he should take it. I said, "Look, you're 26 years old and you've never had a job. Take the contract."

Six weeks later he was back home. I asked him what happened. He said,

I just couldn't make it. I didn't know how to get an apartment so the owner had to help me. I kept forgetting where to change buses. I didn't know if I should get a black and white or color TV. I just couldn't make all those decisions.

At age 17 I was struck that Government paternalism steals from people the ability to make decisions about their own lives. They are all dead now. Richie Robinson, Esica Ogema, Tom Bowstring, Frank Rabbit, Johnny Wakanabo, Tom Goggleye. Dead too young. Not because Government did too little. Because Government did too much.

Having done so well with the American Indian, we have replicated the reservation in every major city in America with the very same results: Teenage pregnancies, crime, drugs, violence, no fathers in those homes. Not because Government did too little. Because Government did too much.

In spite of the total collapse of communism and socialism round the world, Liberals continue to believe that they are smarter than the people and that governments make better decisions.

They do not know, as we know, that the human being dreams, not for one

more Government program but for freedom. The Soviets learned that in just 73 years.

Ilya Ehrenberg, a Russian poet, wrote, "If all the world were covered with asphalt, one day in that asphalt, a crack would appear, and in that crack grass would grow." That is the dream of the human spirit. That is the dream of freedom.

All of this is to say the following: Liberal efforts to replace your decisions with their decisions have been a colossal failure. It has been a failure for the taxpayer, but much more so for the generations of children destroyed in the process. Why is it so difficult in American politics to commit a truth?

We want to end the suffering of the poor in the care and feeding of the Federal Government. We want to rekindle the dream, to free the spirit, to let it soar.

This election is going to be the meanest election in your lifetimes. Because there is so much at stake. The Liberals know that another loss could send their party the way of the Whig Party. Like the current Democrat Party, the Whig Party was a disparate collection of groups who had only one thing in common. They hated Andy Jackson. When his presence disappeared, so did they.

The four building blocks of the Democratic Party are labor, blacks, feminists, and gays. What in the world do labor and gays have in common? They all have a thirst for the power to make your decisions for you. All four groups want power because they believe that they can gain economic advantage in Washington that they cannot gain in the neighborhood. Again the question: "Who decides? Washington or you?"

The commitment by labor unions to spend \$35 million in negative television commercials is their last gasp. In addition to that, they will spend another \$300 million paying the salaries of full-time campaigners in Democrat campaigns. None of that will be reported to the public the way that candidates report the money they raise and spend to the Federal Election Commission. Remember that the next time some "reformer" tells you that candidates spend too much money campaigning.

But, there is hope. Do you remember Ronald Reagan?

It is important to remember how dark the nightfall was when he began running for President. On the eve of his first run for the Presidency in 1975 he spoke at the 20th anniversary of National Review. In a somber moment he quoted something written two decades earlier by Whittaker Chambers.

Chambers wrote:

It is idle to speak of saving Western civilization, because Western civilization is already a wreck from within. That is why we can hope to little more than snatch a fingernail off a saint on the rack or a handful of ashes from the faggots and bury them secretly in a flour pot until that day ages hence when a few men would dare to believe that there once was something else. That

something else is thinkable and there were those at the great nightfall who took loving care to preserve the tokens of hope and truth.

Five years later Reagan was President promising to rekindle the American dream.

It has been said that the American dream was to own your own home. That is not the American dream. The American dream is to get your kids out of your home. And when Ronald Reagan took office, many Americans wondered if they ever could.

We had interest rates at 21 percent, inflation at 14 percent, and 11 percent unemployment.

We were also losing the cold war. Between 1970 and 1980 the Soviet Union had increased its influence in Cuba, Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, Nicaragua, Grenada, Mozambique, Angola, Ethiopia, Afghanistan, South Yemen, Libya, Iraq, and Syria.

On top of that one-third of our planes unable to fly for lack of spare parts, one-third of our ships in dry dock, soldiers practicing with pretend bullets, and much of our enlisted corps on food stamps.

In his first inaugural address Reagan addressed our difficulties at home and abroad. Then he appealed to the best in us. He said, "We can do this, because, after all, we are Americans." The decade of the eighties was the American decade in the American century. I know that the Clinton's, during the 1992 campaign, called it the decade of greed. Maybe they thought every American was trading in cattle futures. Most Americans were not. They were starting businesses, going to church, coaching little league, teaching school, paying taxes, and giving to charity.

In less than a decade, Americans, not government, created 4 million businesses and 20 million new jobs. They doubled the size of the economy and doubled revenues to the treasury. They doubled the money they gave to charities—to strangers—because they were generous.

And if we get the burdens of high taxes and too much regulation off their backs, they will do it again.

America is great, not because of Government policies or wise politicians. America is great because ordinary people do extraordinary things. When we return decisions to the American people and responsibilities to the communities I believe that they, not the Federal Government but they, will once again recapture the greatness we have known. If we fail, America will be the next century's Soviet Union. Not because government did too little. Because government did too much.

□ 2030

DORNAN REPLIES TO GUNDERSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recog-

nized for 5 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from California, Mrs. SEASTRAND, who will follow with 30 minutes that I think Members are going to find fascinating.

Mr. Speaker, I had 60 minutes tonight but everybody was jumping the gun and assuming that in a special order tonight at 8:30 East Coast time or later, 9:30 after the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. KLINK, does his special order, that I was going to respond to the Member from the Third District of Wisconsin, STEVE GUNDERSON, on his peculiar point of personal privilege yesterday.

I have talked to the parliamentarians and my honor was impugned at several points during Mr. GUNDERSON's strange point of personal privilege. If I had been here, I could have taken his words down time after time and had them stricken from the RECORD. I stood not mesmerized but fascinated at home. I will at some point, as the parliamentarians agreed, take a point of special privilege during the middle of the day, probably earlier than he did his. He did his around 3:30. That will be done in good time, probably next week, and I will set straight the perversion of facts that took place.

I am going to include for the RECORD the reply of the reporter, a man of honor, Marc Morano, to Representative STEVE GUNDERSON, it is fascinating; I want to put in the reply of the Family Research Council, it is fascinating; and I am going to put in again Billy Graham's beautiful address in the Rotunda on May 2 that he titled "The Hope for America," where he said that we are paying an awful price for what has happened in our land with moral issues. And then he said, "We are a society poised on the brink of self-destruction."

In the few moments left, Mr. Speaker, I will read from a letter from one of the outstanding researchers over at Family Research Council, he was a stalwart at Empower America, and it was in response to a good friend of mine saying the Christian Coalition might be obsessed with the issue of homosexuality.

Likewise CATO's David Boaz used the term to attack the Family Research Council in the New York Times. Funny you don't hear anyone accused of being obsessed with taxes, defense of our country, deregulation, education, or any number of other issues no matter how passionately they argue or how often. The "obsession" tag is used specifically in the homosexual debate, and I think I know why, he continues.

Because it implies a secret, hypocritical propensity for homosexuality. It is a nifty little smear that homosexual activists use routinely. That is why I winced when I found the nameless mutual friend of Mr. Knight's and myself had used the term unknowingly at the Road to Victory conference.

We have seen a debauching of the English language, a synonym for cheer-

ful, happy, mirthful, good-natured, the word "gay," the root word of gala, substituted for the death in their prime of life of over 300,000 young males in America who have the word "gay" and "gaiety" put in the place of "sad" and "play."

We have seen a word created that is phony. I have four years of Latin. There is no such word as homophobia. Phobia of man, homo? If they mean homosexual phobia or decadence phobia, that would be more accurate, but it is not a phobia. It may be an aversion to seeing the collapse of our society or, as Billy Graham put it, a great Nation on the brink of self-destruction. I shall be back with that theme soon.

Mr. Speaker, Fair is fair and facts are powerful. Here is Mr. Morano's powerful rebuttal to the Member from Wisconsin who will retire in less than five months, effective Jan. 3, 1996.

MARC MORANO REPLIES TO REPRESENTATIVE STEVE GUNDERSON

The following is my response to Congressman Steve Gunderson's (R-WI) point of personal privilege delivered on the House floor on May 14, 1996:

It is an outrage that a U.S. Congressman would interrupt a session of Congress and take to the House floor and slander the character of a reporter whom he never met. Congressman Steve Gunderson said on the House floor that "hate and prejudice are the motives by which Mr. Morano * * * sought to totally misrepresent the fund raising events and their purpose." He further states that I "intentionally falsified information" and that my report is "the journalism of bigotry and prejudice." How Congressman Gunderson knows all of this about me remains a mystery.

The Washington Times reported today that at least three other people who attended the night dance can corroborate my account. John Cloud, a city paper reporter said he witnessed "a fair number of people using drugs." A columnist in Metro Weekly described the dance as follows: "We spent much of our time out on the dance floor trying to cop a feel, or back in the sponsors lounge trying to cop a feel, or outside in the designated smoking area trying to cop a feel and a smoke." In addition, Jim Jennings, who works for one of the sponsors of the event admitted to seeing "very provocative dancing."

The freedom of the press is a fundamental right set forth in the Constitution. Congressman Steven Gunderson's character assassination of me on the House floor has a chilling effect on free speech. Will reporters in the future now hesitate to come forth with a controversial story for fear our elected leaders will use their office to attack the reporters entire career, question their motives and engage in vicious name calling? Congressman Gunderson, by impugning my professional reputation, has proven that he is not above "questioning other peoples motives" and stereotyping whom he knows nothing about. The fact of the matter is that my report is entirely factual. I ask Congressman Gunderson to publicly apologize for his unfounded assault on my character. The dignity of his position demands that a retraction be forthcoming.

The following is a detailed response to Rep. Gunderson's point of personal privilege delivered on the House floor on May 14, 1996. First, I reaffirm that the report of my observations of the Cherry Jubilee's Main Event